Meeting was called to order at 12:55 pm

In attendance:
- D. Cossey, M. Parlett-Sweeney, F. Orellana, F. Davis, M. Walker (proxy for S. Sargent), R. Koopmann, A. Carne, A. Major '12, T. Shaikh '11

Absent:
- T. McFadden, V. Barr

Guests:
- M. Malatesta (Admissions), T. Dvorak (Committee on Teaching), R. Surman (Committee on Teaching)

1) Dave Cossey gave a brief description as to why Admissions and Committee on Teaching were invited to attend the meeting.

2) Matt Malatesta began the discussion by talking about the fact that prospective students do not seem to have overt technology wishes but assume that the campus has wireless and high-speed Internet access throughout including dorm rooms. He feels that there is an expectation that students should be able to do anything they did in their high school and more. Matt thinks that the “way Admissions communicates with students” sets part of the expectations that prospective students have about the use of technology on campus. In other words, if students can apply online, check status of admission paperwork, take virtual tours, etc. then they perceive the institution as being strong technology-wise. Ajay agreed with this assessment of the situation and said that Admissions is the “portal” to the campus and how they communicate is important.

Mark wondered whether or not colleges and universities were in an “arms race” trying to compete with each other. Matt’s response was that things are not yet out of control. Examples of services that every institution needs to be offering would be online course registration/scheduling. Examples of something that presents a poor image of technology on campus would be surfing the web site and finding dead links. Other areas that we may need to start competing in would be integrating the Student Information System with web services so that students can get personalized information about such things as tuition payments, course requirements; currently there really is no data mining for students.

Mary asked about what types of technology Admissions staff saw when they went to visit high schools. Matt said that in most cases Union has the stuff already on campus and that it’s simply a matter of how it gets presented.
3) The discussion then switched to the faculty perspective on students and technology. Fernando began by asking about Facebook and student expectations regarding faculty use of Facebook. Matt felt that it is becoming expected that institutions as well as faculty will have some presence on Facebook; but he said that he was worried about using Facebook to “Sell” the college to students. Fernando indicated that there is a need for education on the use and etiquette of social networking sites (specifically Facebook). Felmon brought up issues of privacy and the fact that there also needs to be education about how privacy should be viewed on sites such as Facebook.

Tomas said that the COT had not heard comments about faculty not using technology; COT’s focus was really on teaching as effectively as possible whether with chalk or with technology. COT’s mission is to facilitate discussions with faculty about effective teaching. Tomas thought that the COT should consider collaborating with CACT in a session (perhaps in the spring) and wondered whether or not we had statistics about workshops that ITS holds or the number of Blackboard courses. Mark wanted to know whether or not ITS pushed Blackboard as a solution to faculty. Dave told him that ITS does not push Blackboard but does try to facilitate the use of the course management system.

Ajay brought up that fact that the use of technology really depends on the course and that it can help with various learning styles. Tomas thought that a bringing an expert to discuss learning styles might be beneficial to the campus. Mark discussed the fact that there is no mechanism for faculty to be made aware of student expectations with respect to technology use within a course since the course evaluations don’t look at student expectations.

Tomas said that one thing that might be helpful to faculty would be to find out what’s being done on campus – for example, if faculty who don’t use Blackboard found out that an increasing number of their colleagues were using Blackboard that could be an impetus for people to start using Blackboard. Mark talked about created video clips which he then shared with colleagues. Felmon thought that the idea of discussions on specific uses of technology on campus might be helpful. Mary mentioned Mark’s idea of “content-specialists” – faculty within a discipline presenting technologies that they use to their colleagues.

Tomas’ last comment was that it would be very beneficial if faculty had the ability to do online grade submittal. Dave gave a brief description of the online grading pilot that occurred in Spring 2008. Felmon, Dave, and Mark talked about online course evaluations and the fact that response rates would probably go down.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 pm.

Reminder: CACT website: http://minerva.union.edu/accsc